## FAX TRANSMISSION - Law Department

Honeywell 15801 Woods Edge Road Colonial Heights, VA 23834

RE-SENT

Date: 5/17/01

Examiner N. Eloshway

# of Pages;

Company: USPTO

(including cover)

Fax #: 703-305-3579

Urgent

Phone #:

Please Review

From: Virginia Szigeti Andrews

Reply ASAP

Fax #: 804-520-3568 Phone # 804-520-3651

(Call if you did not receive all pages, or if document is illegible)

MESSAGE:

**GROUP ART UNIT: 3727** SERIAL NO.: 08/747,471 FILED: November 12, 1996

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 30-3744CIP2CPA

Virginia Szeget andrews

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent via facsimile 703-305-3579 to Examin r Eloshway, on May 17, 2001.

Virginia Szigeti Andrews Registration No.: 29,039 **FAX RECEIVED** 

MAY 1-8 2001

**GROUP 3700** 

WARNING: Unauthorized interception of this facsimile transmission may be a violation of federal or State law

This message is intended only for use by the Individual or entity to which it is addressed and contains privileged or confidential business information the disclosure of which may be a violation of federal or state law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is illegal and strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return the original message to us at the address listed above via U.S. Postal Service. Thank you...

	AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER				ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 30-3744CIP2		
SERIAL NUMBER:	FILING D	ATE:	EXAMINER		GPOUD ADT	LDIPP	
08/747,471			1		GROUP ART UNIT: 3727		
	IITS AND ARTICI						
TO THE ASSIST	OR PALLEY ET A  ANT COMMISSIONE	R FOR PA	TENTS:		<del>-</del>	<u> </u>	
Transmitted here	with is an amendment i		e-identified application.		alculated as s	shown below.	
43		CL	AIMS AS AMENDED				
(1)	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3)	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) NO. OF EXTRA CLAIMS PRESENT	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEE	
TOTAL CLAIMS	52	MINUS	52	0	X SIR	0	
NDEP. CLAIMS	6	MINUS	6	0	X \$78	0	
	<u> </u>			L ADDITIONAL FEI THIS AMENDMENT		0	
	is sheet is enclosed.		posit Account No.			triplicate	
A triplica	ists that the \$ 890.00 te copy of this sheet is only additional fees to De	enclosed.	,	locument required u Deposit Account No	nder 37 C.F.) 0. 01-1125	R. 1.136	
A triplica	sts that the \$ 890.00 te copy of this sheet is	enclosed.	fee be charged to	locument required un Deposit Account No	nder 37 C.F.I 0. 01-1125 Indiews	R. 1.136	
A triplica	te copy of this sheet is only additional fees to De  May 17, 2001	enclosed.	fee be charged to	Deposit Account No	n. 01-1125	R. 1.136	
A triplica	te copy of this sheet is only additional fees to De  May 17, 2001	enclosed.	fee be charged to	Deposit Account No	n. 01-1125	R. 1.136	

Patent and Trademark Office - U.S. DEPARTMENT of COMMERCE

**PATENTS** IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit: 3727 Reg for Record
Examiner: N. Eloshway
P.D. File No.: 30-3744CIP2

In re Application of: IGOR PALLEY ET AL.

Serial No.:

08/747,471

Filed:

November 12, 1996

For:

BARRIER UNITS AND ARTICLES MADE THEREFROM

Colonial Heights, VA May 17, 2001

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2001, please enter the remarks that follow

## **REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the finality of the last Office Action.

Applicants further note that there is no discussion of the rejection of claim 52 in the present Office Action although the Summary Sheet indicates that claim 52 stands rejected. Applicants request clarification on the grounds of rejection of claim 52.

Claims 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC§112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner maintains this rejection on the basis that there is insufficient antecedent support for the limitation "the interrupted band" in line 2 of each of these claims. Both of claims 16 and 20 are indirectly dependent on claim 1, which at line 6 refers to "said band being interrupted across the length thereof". This language, it is respectfully submitted, provides appropriate and sufficient antecedent support for the limitations forming the basis of